DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 931 HE 028 106

AUTHOR Ramaley, Judith A.
TITLE From "My Work" to "Our Work": Realigning Faculty Work with College and University Purposes.
PUB DATE Jan 95
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards (3rd, Phoenix, AZ, January 19-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; *Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *College Faculty; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Mission Statements; Organizational Change; Resistance to Change; Self Evaluation (Groups); State Universities; Strategic Planning; Teacher Role; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Attitudes; *Portland State University OR

ABSTRACT

Efforts at Portland State University (PSU) in Oregon illustrate how an institution can clarify its own purposes, evaluate how the environment supports its academic mission, and effectively institute changes that will bring faculty activities and institutional purposes into a more harmonious alignment. In 1990 PSU began a strategic planning process that produced a two sentence mission statement and a set of institutional characteristics to develop and promote. With these in place a process to examine whether faculty roles and rewards matched the mission and role of the institution began. Faculty attitudes toward redefined roles and responsibilities were found to fall into four categories--either committed, cautious, skeptical, or or strongly opposed. Even though initial projects focused on faculty change were chosen with care, change took longer than expected. Overall the PSU efforts focused on: (1) creating an environment that supports change; (2) expanding the scope of change; (3) making connections and creating conditions that will sustain change; and (4) re-balancing the campus in the wake of the ripple effect that the change efforts created. Finally, the experience seemed to support a broad conclusion that institutions and individuals must be prepared for continuous change. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 378 931

Third AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards
"From 'My Work' to 'Our Work': Realigning Faculty Work with College and University Purposes."Judith A. Ramaley

HE 028 106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith Ramaley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Third AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards
"From 'My Work' to 'Our Work': Realigning Faculty Work with College and University Purposes."Judith A. Ramaley

The nature of the problem:

Colleges and universities are under a number of pressures, generated by both internal and external constituencies. These pressures include financial constraints, demands for accountability and enhanced productivity, concerns about student learning and values, student and family concerns about employability and the availability of jobs, demands from policymakers for responsiveness to societal problems and a trend toward seeking private answers to public questions (e.g. privatization, contracting for services, reinventing government. high tuition/high aid proposals). New internal and external demands are creating significant strains in the roles and expectations placed upon faculty, whose interests and professional goals may not be effectively aligned with institutional purposes as our colleges and universities seek to respond to changing societal demands.

The purpose of this discussion is to describe how an institution can clarify its own purposes, evaluate the environment that it provides to support its academic mission, and effectively institute changes that will bring faculty activities and institutional purposes into a more harmonious alignment.

The Environment for Institutional Change.

This nation has begun an extensive reassessment of the quality and effectiveness of its educational system, focusing on all aspects of the educational experience from pre-Kindergarten to postgraduate study and research. Any thorough review of institutional purposes and accomplishments should occur on a background of assumptions about the context for educational reform.

1. Educational reform will take place in a complex environment composed of local, regional and national resources, and institutional relationships and influences. No institution, public or private, is self-contained. Any serious approach to institutional role, mission and purpose must begin with a thorough understanding of the context within which a given college or university operates and the nature of the influences, direct or indirect, that it must manage and tap in order to achieve its intentions.

2. Significant educational reform must occur throughout an entire system of education in order to be effective. We are only beginning to understand how students actually move through a system of education and how far a system really extends, especially in urban areas. At Portland State University, we have recently found that a significant proportion of our transfer students do not make a clean shift from another institution to ours. Instead, they may switch back and forth or study at more than one institution in the same term or in the same year. No matter how carefully we structure our educational environment, the students are, in fact, shaping their own educational experience, intentionally or otherwise, by patching together an education based on study at several institutions.

3. As educational systems become more closely linked, a change in K-12 will create expectations for change throughout postsecondary education as well, whether we wish to change or not. Students will arrive on our doorsteps with very different expectations and competencies as the educational reform movement spreads throughout the nation.

4. The reorganization and restructuring of our institutions may be the dominant theme in higher education for the rest of this decade.

In approaching this task, we would be well served to apply a variety of frames of reference to our study of our own structure, campus environments and working relationships. A major shift that is beginning to occur in our collective understanding of organizations and how they work. The old "define, assign" paradigm reflected in organizational charts and specific roles and responsibilities must give way to a much more collaborative and self-organizing or "learning" environment in which tasks are managed collectively and evaluated from the perspective of the users rather than defined by the service providers and where both individual and collective performsance must be rewarded.

Higher Education faces a major stumbling block in attempting to become more accountable and productive. "Productivity in higher education is influenced by an interacting web of administrative policies, environmental pressures, and political processes."[1] In general, most of us tend to analyze our

---

[1]Robert Birnbaum, "The Constraints on Campus Productivity" inAnderson, Richard E. and Joel W. Myerson,Eds, Productivity and Higher Education. Improving the Effectiveness of Faculty, Facilities, and Financial Resources, Petersons, Guides, Princteton, p. 23-47

campuses and how they work using the tools of inquiry we first absorbed in our academic fields. If education is actually the process of "converting tangible resources into intangible resources" as Birnbaum suggests, then whatever inputs and outputs we utilize to monitor our progress in achieving our goals or in measuring the impact of changes we impose are actually somewhat arbitrary and based on our personal values and academic experiences as well as a social consensus about what is both measurable and worth measuring.[2]

It follows that this same difficulty will extend to our efforts to match up faculty roles and rewards more meaningfully with institutional purposes. What changes can we institute? How will we know that we are achieving our institutional goals? How will our chief critics and supporters know whether we are productive, that is using our resources, including faculty time and effort, in the most efficient and effective way possible to produce high quality programs of research and education?

In approaching a particular campus, it is helpful to apply multiple frames of reference in describing the resources available, both tangible and intangible, the patterns of influence and power, and the factors critical to the success of the particular institution. These factors are the starting point for studying what faculty and students actually do, what motivates them, and what they actually accomplish. A careful study of the circumstances of a particular institution, in relationship to the environment for higher education in general, is essential to determining whether there is a gap between faculty roles and rewards and institutional purposes. If a significant gap is found, these findings can aid in the selection of strategies that will close the gap.

. A useful set of frames is offered by Harold Linstone and his co-author Ian Mitroff.[3] Linstone and Mitroff use three ways of understanding organizations and how they work: the Technical, the Organizational, and the Personal.

Each approach has value, but all three should be used in order to understand the important elements in a particular situation that may affect how effectively a change can be introduced. Each perspective also tends to lead the observer to consider different solutions or strategies. Each perspective by itself

---

[2]Robert Birnbaum, ob cit, p. 25

[3] Harold A. Linstone with Ian I. Mitroff, The Challenge of the 21st Century. managing Technology and Ourselves in Shrinking World, State University of New York Press,Albany, New York, 1994,406 pgs.

has limitations, "such as artificial boundaries, unwarranted assumptions, and oversimplifications"[4] but used together, these frameworks can provide a very helpful guide to examining very complex environments and situations.

The Technical framework is derived from a science-technology world view and has as its objective problem-solving and the design and production of a tangible product. It is approached through the collection of data, analysis, and model-building. In this approach the time horizon is far away, the basis for evaluating the quality of a solution is to examine its logic and rationality, and problems tend to be simplified and studied in ideal settings. As Linstone explains, "The approach works well for those problems beyond science and engineering that are tame, docile, or well-structured."[5] By itself, the Technical framework cannot incorporate all of the elements of educational reform, which is certainly not tame or docile, and often, not well-structured either. Yet, we tend to rely on this approach because it seems so simple and clear in comparison to the complexities of mapping out the cultural and political fields of influence on our campuses.

The Organizational framework is built on the examination of how people interact with each other and the kind of culture or organization they create. Through this framework, we are drawn to looking at processes, actions, and values adopted intentionally or unintentionally by a group. Using this framework, we tend to focus on problems and how they are characterized by different people or different groups of people within an organization. Instead of collecting data, observers who are working in an organizational mode act through debate, consensus and argument. The interactions may be adversarial or collegial but a good outcome is judged by how fair or just it is, rather than by how logical or rational it is. A lot of what goes on in debates about the curriculum can be described as Organizational as faculty from different disciplines and departments seek to find common ground. This perspective is very politically sensitive. The nature of the organization and the culture created by its members may create "great resistance to experimentation, risk-taking, innovation, and tolerance of other organizations' perspectives."[6] It is obviously very important to assess the climate for change in a department or on a campus

[4] Linstone p. 93

[5] Linstone, p. 90

[6] Linstone p. 101

in planning a strategy for introducing a new or significantly revised definition of faculty roles and rewards.

The Personal framework is really a filter through which each of us sees the world. This interpretive filter is built upon the accumulated experiences of the individual and includes many influences including "parents, social peers, education, religion,"[7] academic discipline, attitudes toward risk or change and the like. When we worry about how a particular change or situation will affect us as individuals, we are using the Personal perspective. . In academic settings, this often translates into questions of power, prestige, influence, and the distribution of resources and recognition. A particular solution will most likely be evaluated by considering whether it is right or wrong from our point of view. This contrasts with Technical approaches which are tested by their rationality and logic and Organizational approaches which are tested by their fairness to all concerned parties.

It is extremely helpful to apply all of these frameworks at the same time. Within the context of faculty roles, faculty and administrators from different disciplines will most likely prefer one framework over the others because their scholarly interests and modes of inquiry are most compatible with that particular way of looking at problems. It is helpful intentionally to use all three approaches in order to tap the special strengths of each participant in the design and review process. In most cases, of course, everyone will impose a Personal framework on any discussion.

5. The campus environment must change in significant ways to support collaborative and community-based work. Most especially, we must develop creditable and comprehensive measurements of productivity, quality and impact of institutions that are operating in a collaborative mode, both across disciplines and programs and in association with other institutions and organizations. Although each institution has its own history and traditions, a common element for most of us is the need to rethink individual and collective responsibilities of faculty and staff. It is rare to find a campus whose policies, infrastructure and reward systems effectively support and assess collective faculty activities.

Getting Started.

[7] Linstone, p. 102

There are always more reasons not to change than anyone would ever anticipate. Some of the more common ones are:

- inertia or "this, too, shall pass"
- campus politics and distrust of the motives of leadership
- complex overly ambitious plans that exhaust the participants before the change even begins
- technological shortcomings
- lack of sufficient skills, times and financial resources
- entrenched attitudes and behaviors, especially about what constitutes excellence or "what will be rewarded here"
- financial or political pressures from outside that derail or confuse the change process( e.g. voter initiatives, legislative directives)

To counteract all the forces that resist change, it is important to take time to build an institution-specific case for change. The case may be provided by a serious financial or political crisis that is clearly long-term or it can be initiated from within the campus through a process of study and self-assessment. Whether the question of the need for change is self-generated or imposed from without, the basic process that follows from there can be the same.[8]

The first step is to free campus participants from the limitations of their own campus experiences. This helps move the discussion away from such topics as "what is the President up to?" to a more collegial study of national experiences and challenges. A particularly effective way to initiate this process is to form a campus roundtable, a process pioneered by The Pew Roundtable at The University of Pennsylvania. A campus Roundtable is composed of a mixture of faculty, staff, students and external constituents who are willing to take a fresh look at the campus and those who are somewhat doubtful about the value of doing so. This group can then study national research and policy papers on higher education, consult with external scholars/experts, and relate this national literature to the actual conditions and experiences of their particular institution.

Another way to begin is to identify a team of individuals to send to a national conference on a topic that might serve as an effective starting point for campus discussion about its own mission and accomplishments.

---

[8] Michael L. Heifetz, Leading Change, Overcoming Chaos.Ten Speed Press, Berkeley, California 1993, 203 pgs.

Whatever a campus community does to initiate a discussion of faculty roles and rewards, it must start with a clear institutional mission. Most college and university missions are very long and very noble. They do not, however, provide a basis for describing what the institution really hopes to accomplish and how it will be able to tell how successfully it does so.

In 1990, Portland State University began a strategic planning process. The faculty and administrators who had been at the institution for a long time emitted a collective groan, since the campus community had planned at roughly decade-long intervals and had never seen any tangible results from the effort spent. This time, however, the process yielded better results. The mission statement that was crafted after discussion with many different constituencies was short, only two sentences long, and provided an excellent basis for describing what an urban university should be. Our experience can serve as an example of the importance of starting any discussion of faculty roles and rewards with a clear mission and a clear articulation of the institutional behaviors or qualities that will support that mission.

The Portland State University mission reads as follows:

"The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to the metropolitan area. The University will actively promote development of a network of educational institutions that will serve the community and support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the metropolitan area."

This sort of mission statement lends itself to a short list of defining characteristics of the institution, in this case, an urban university, that can form the starting point for discussing how faculty can contribute to the achievement of our institutional mission. The characteristics we chose to highlight are described in Table 1.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Urban University

- committed to excellence in undergraduate liberal education
- provides access to graduate and professional programs central to the needs and opportunities of the metropolitan area

• responsive to the needs of metropolitan students

• uses the region as an extended campus

• commitment to enhancing the quality of metropolitan life

• designs its scholarly agenda in collaboration with members of the metropolitan community

• promotes an academic research network through collaborations with community groups

• supports a network of educational institutions designed to support access and student success

• actively seeks partnerships at the graduate and professional level with other universities

With these two starting points clearly in place-a distinctive mission and a working definition of the institutional behavior that supports such a mission, it is possible to examine whether faculty roles and rewards are matched up effectively with the mission and role of the institution. In our case, many faculty were interpreting their roles in a manner consistent with the purposes of an urban university, but many were not and the institution had done very little to encourage one perspective over another.

The next step may well be to engage in some "reality therapy." Unless the institution has recently completed a rigorous self-study either for planning purposes or accreditation purposes, it would be wise to spell out the assumptions people have about how well the institution is accomplishing its mission and why it is getting the results it has obtained. Several issues may well be revealed by honest self-appraisal backed up by whatever relevant data can be obtained to validate that appraisal. Here is what we learned about ourselves:

• The gap between faculty expectations and institutional needs had grown wider and more unclear over the years as different administrations sought to define a mission for the institution and chart its course.

• In the absence of any clear focus, the institution was experiencing "mission creep" toward research university status. The value still attached by state policymakers to "higher" Carnegie classifications had created a pressure to engage in traditional forms of research rather than a broader range of scholarly activities that better reflects the knowledge needs of the community we serve.

• Our quality was too often measured, both by outsiders and by ourselves by research university or selective liberal arts college standards although our

needs as an urban university certainly called for different ways to measure quality. Here, as elsewhere, quality is often confused with "prestige" or reputation, which in turn, is shaped by narrow definitions of excellence.

• Our students were becoming more heterogeneous in experience, ethnicity, motivations, learning and cognitive styles and expectations than our faculty, although, in the early days of the institution, this was not the case.

• Our own preoccupation and concerns did not match up very well with the questions being asked by legislators, business people, students and parents.

Although somewhat painful, this self-assessment provides the basis for our institutional efforts to rethink faculty roles and rewards. There are a number of incentives for institutions to undertake this reexamination:

• The areas of scholarship encouraged by the institution will be more closely aligned with institutional purposes and expectations.

• There will be a positive impact on campus constituents whose interests and concerns will help shape the nature and focus of scholarly work.

• There will be less role strain and "mission creep" if the faculty know and embrace a clear institutionally-specific definition of roles and responsibilities and are not required to draw on their own graduate experience, usually at a traditional research university, to define quality scholarly activity ( unless of course, they are, in fact, at an institution with a traditional research mission).

• Faculty will serve as models to students of a broad range of intellectual activity including teamwork, project management and collaborative work, all forms of inquiry that are especially adaptable to professional practice.

Creating an environment that supports change.

1. Selecting the first project. Once an institution has developed a mission statement and a clear understanding of the range of faculty activities that must be supported and rewarded in order for the institution to achieve its purposes, faculty must be persuaded to undertake these activities. In my experience, faculty attitudes toward the newly defined roles and responsibilities tend to fall into one of four categories, Committed, Cautious, Skeptical, or Strongly Opposed. Faculty will probably be recruited into the new mode at different times during the change process, depending upon their starting attitudes and different

conditions will be necessary to draw different groups of faculty into the new ways of doing things.

It is very important to realize that change takes longer than anyone ever expects and will require a number of institutional adaptations it if is to be sustained. A common problem is to initiate a project or pilot experiment with faculty or staff who already embrace the desired change and pay little if any attention to the intentional recruitment of the more cautious or skeptical as the project develops. The initial project can, unless the entire change process is thought through, either become encapsulated as a special program or environment within the institution or be snuffed out altogether.

Some thought must be given to selecting the initial project. Should it be in an administrative area or an academic area? Should it be small or large scale? Should it involve a hand-picked core group or be initiated by a competitive or volunteer process? Should it be in a key area or a peripheral area? The goal of the first project is to create a climate of possibility; i.e. to show that change is possible and manageable and will produce positive effects. The selection of a focus will depend upon a careful study of the particular institutional experience and culture.

One way to select a project is to listen carefully to the ways people explain why things are the way they are. Usually, there is a common mythology about this and a first project might be selected to show that it is possible to make a meaningful change. At Portland State University, I was usually told either that "they" won't let us do whatever it is or that we simply didn't have enough resources and that is why things were the way they are. It was natural to pick a first project to demonstrate that the nebulous "they" did not exist and that real change is possible, at least in some cases, without spending a lot of additional dollars.

Portland State chose to launch its first project in an administrative area. Our pilot project was The Tale of the Light Bulb. Although the first project had nothing to do with faculty, it was easy to see ( exterior lights that burned out on the campus were replaced more quickly) and a number of critical aspects of the campus culture were addressed that might otherwise have slowed down any intentional change process ( e.g. it doesn't do any good to complain around here because nobody listens; this problem is all *their* fault; *they* won't let us do things differently)

2. Expanding the Scope of Change.

After a few projects have been completed, the campus will have a small, core group of participants who have learned that change is possible and that it will not be dictated from the top. There will an initial flurry of excitement or anxiety and information about what is going on will still be anecdotal and sketchy. It is useful to include in the early stage a few of the campus "gatekeepers" to whom other people turn for explanations or interpretations of campus events to facilitate acceptance of these early efforts.

At PSU, after one or more small projects were undertaken in administrative areas, we took our first leap into the realm of academic programming by focusing on the reform of our General Education Curriculum. To make the leap to a project of major scale, a campus needs to have a planning team in place, there must be a clear mission-related project and indicators or benchmarks to guide the change process and the campus must have had at least a few positive experiences with intentional change. It is very important at this point to obtain external validation of the campus experiences and assumptions by inviting outside experts to come to campus or by sending a team of campus representatives to a national conference or workshop where the topic of your campus project will be the focus of discussion.

At this stage, those committed faculty whose scholarly interests are consistent with institutional purposes will have become involved in the first academic project. These individuals already are in tune with the mission and goals of the institution and are contributing to its success and will embrace the new idea readily. For these individuals, it is only necessary to recognize their work, celebrate their accomplishments and reflect within the institutional reward systems the broader context and impact of their work. This can be done by building a broader, institutionally-appropriate definition of scholarship into promotion and tenure guidelines, hiring policies, and merit salary criteria.

Once scholarship has been defined within the context of the institutional mission, the institution must provide creditable and workable mechanisms for recording and assessing the quality and impact of scholarly work of all kinds. This will permit the institution to reward a broader array of excellent work without appearing to be arbitrary and capricious or seeming to work beyond or

in spite of traditional standards. Robert Boyer[9] and Robert Diamond[10] have laid the foundation for a way to assess scholarship, defined in the broader ways we have described. Nearly ten years ago, Elman and Smock working with the traditional terms of research, teaching and professional service, set the stage for an approach to the evaluation of broader forms of scholarly activity.

> They said, " Professional service...refers exclusively to work that draws upon one's professional expertise and is an outgrowth of one's academic discipline. In fact, it is composed of the same activities as traditional teaching and research but directed toward a different audience. In essence, where traditional teaching and research are directed primarily toward contributions to the creation of knowledge, service... refers to the same contributions directed toward knowledge for society's welfare." [11]

In addition to a population of naturally receptive faculty, every institution has a group of more cautious but interested faculty who have an inclination to work in "non traditional" ways but who will wait for clear institutional signals before venturing into new roles or activities. For such people, faculty development programs that call for proposals in new areas of inquiry, such as community-based or interdisciplinary research or curricular innovation or other forms of scholarly activity valued by the institution and necessary for it to achieve its mission, will send a clear message that such work will be encouraged and supported. This strategy will only work if care has already been taken to amend promotion and tenure guidelines, to define ways to document the quality of these nontraditional scholarly contributions and to seek out candidates for promotion who exemplify these modes of scholarship.

As the first big project expands, new people must be invited to participate and actively recruited. There will be initial short-term gains or failures but the first group will generally continue to support the project, so long as there is frequent and positive feedback about the value of what they are doing. At this

---

[9] Robert Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered. Priorities of the Professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton University Press, 1990147pgs.

[10] Robert M. Diamond, Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review. A Faculty Guide.Anker Publishing Company,Boston, Ma, 1995 68pgs.

[11] Sandra E. Elman and Sue Marx Smock, Professional Service and Faculty Rewards. Toward an Integrated Structure. Division of Urban Affairs, NASULGC,Washington DC, 199556 pgs.

point, significant campus investments must be made to reassure the uncertain or skeptical that these changes are really campus priorities and that resources will flow to people and programs that support these institutional goals.

Waiting behind those willing to respond to calls for proposals and incentives for trying new modes of inquiry is a group of people who take a "wait and see" attitude, who have seen academic leaders arrive with fresh ideas and leave almost as abruptly. Such faculty have long since concluded that people who respond too quickly will be left to face their more traditional-minded colleagues after the fresh, new administrators have left for greener pastures. They consider responding to calls for new forms of scholarship or faculty responsibilities to be too risky.

For such skeptics, the creation of support services or technical assistance or an infrastructure designed to assist faculty who work in modes desirable for the institution will reinforce and sustain faculty interest and reassure those who worry that the call for new ways of doing things is only the passing agenda of "the new administration." In addition, a conscientious and sustained plan to hire faculty who bring a broader array of scholarly interests and experiences will increase the proportion of faculty whose interests are consistent with the institutional mission. This may entice some of the reluctant but interested faculty who have been resisting the new ways to try new forms of scholarship. A consistent recruitment policy will also send a signal that many forms of scholarly activity, including traditional scholarship of quality, are valued and respected enough to be sought in new faculty appointments.

The placement of new academic resources on the basis of a broader set of criteria of excellence and accomplishment also will reinforce the idea of the importance of many interpretations of scholarship. Administrators are judged by what they do, not by what they say. There are many hall legends of deans and provosts and presidents who say they support many kinds of scholarship but only promote people who do traditional research and bring in grants and contracts. To combat these tales, patience and clarity will be needed as well as consistency in decision-making about promotion, tenure, merit salary raises, resource allocations, awards and recognition and the like.

Each institution will need to make different investments to create an environment that will nurture and sustain change. These elements that support different ways of interpreting institutional purposes and linking them to faculty activities will include:

• clear faculty roles and responsibilities

faculty and staff development and reward programs consistent with the defined roles and responsibilities

• campus infrastructure and technical support services that support faculty work

• new assessments/measures of quality and impact of the changes made

• a long-term strategy to support change

• resources dedicated to the functions/programs that are being redesigned or changed

One of the most difficult problems facing campuses that wish to undertake ambitious changes is finding the resources to underwrite the costs. In most cases, colleges and universities are facing up to the need for change as the result of significant and sustained fiscal constraints. As William Massy has pointed out,[12] colleges and universities are the victims of two factors that keep escalating our costs. The first problem is that the bulk of our campus budgets is composed of salaries and wages, which are linked through local and national market conditions to overall societal productivity and not to institutional productivity per se. As a result, our unit costs continue to rise even if our productivity, however we might wish to define it, does not. The second problem, which Massy calls "growth force," we bring on ourselves by our unwillingness to stop doing anything we are already doing in order to fund new programs and priorities. As a result, institutions grow by accretion, not by reallocation or redesign.

In order to put real resources behind our change initiatives, we will have to release "frozen" assets, usually within our administrative structure, but sometimes within our academic support structure as well. This necessity has led to a rising flood of writing on campus reengineering and redesign and a significant quality movement within higher education, supported and encouraged by major corporate leaders such as Xerox, Motorola, and IBM.

A college or university that wishes to support a genuine change in the environment for its research and educational mission must be willing to invest significant resources. This can be done through a variety of strategies that free

---

[12] William F. Massy, "Improvement Strategies for Administrative and Support Services," isee reference #1

up either actual dollars or precious time. Some of the approaches that Portland State has used include:

• restructuring and bringing related units together in order to cluster similar activities;

• introduction of technology and the redesign or reengineering of campus operations, facilitated by technology; PSU has gone from a paper environment to an electronic environment;

• quality initiatives and the improvement of campus services without additional expenditures

• investment in staff development programs

• creative use of partnerships with other organizations to support resource sharing and to contain costs

• use of external recognition and awards to encourage the new behavior made possible by releasing frozen assets of dollars and time

3. Making Connections and Creating Conditions that Will Sustain Change..

As the first wave of significant change continues, the campus culture will begin to change as well and there will be significant shifts in attitudes and behavior as faculty and staff begin to map themselves onto the new culture, the new conditions, and the new ways of doing things. To facilitate this process of adaptation and absorption of the new ways, there must be frequent and open discussions of what is happening. During this process, some people will begin to talk about OUR changes rather than THEIR changes or YOUR changes but only a few skeptical faculty will have abandoned their "wait and see" attitude to join the new ways of doing things.

It is probably not helpful to try too hard to recruit either skeptical or opposed faculty. They are watching deeds, not words.A common response of a small percentage of seasoned faculty faced with a strong move to broaden the definition of scholarship or redefine faculty roles is to express confusion. At Portland State University, the word is out among some anxious arts and science faculty who see the university moving more clearly toward a community-based urban mission that, "the President wants us to do community service, the Provost wants us to teach undergraduates and ignore graduate study, and the Dean wants us to bring in grants, do traditional research, publish in mainline journals and work with graduate students. So who are we supposed to believe?"

I interpret this rumor as a symptom of the resistance of two groups of people. The first group I refer to as the Conscientious Objectors. There are traditionally-minded, research - oriented faculty or teaching faculty who do not believe that the new brand of scholarship is valid. They see the institution slipping away from true standards of excellence and may be disappointed that the campus will not become a first-rate traditional research university as they had openly or secretly hoped it would. They also may fear that they will not be able to move to another institution if they fill their resume' with "nontraditional" work.

A second group of resistant faculty simply do not like change or are threatened by a definition of scholarship that might require them or encourage them to become active scholars again. Both groups in this category may question the motives of the academic leadership of the institution and question the wisdom of moving in a new direction that is, as yet, untested.

The conditions necessary to support the urban mission at Portland State University challenge the assumptions that some of our faculty have used to guide their careers. Our new groundrules are based upon clear standards of excellence. However, excellence is interpreted as much from the perspective of students and community members as from the traditional criteria defined by the academic disciplines, although both points of view are recognized and included in our discussions of scholarship. Both points of view will also be reflected in new guidelines for evaluating scholarship that should emerge by the end of the next academic year. It is important to assure all faculty repeatedly that their work, whether it meets traditional criteria for excellence, or the broader criteria, is indeed valued and will be rewarded and recognized.

4. Rebalancing the Campus.

At this point, the areas that have undergone significant change will have created ripples all over campus and other, sometimes seemingly unrelated activities and functions will need to be redesigned to support the new ways of doing things. At Portland State, we chose to begin our process with a total redesign of the General Education Curriculum, knowing that this would set up a chain reaction that would affect the design and delivery of our undergraduate degrees, graduate education, our research mission and our community relationships as well.

A common issue that surfaces at this point is the role of the academic department. To rebalance the campus and reinforce the changes that have occurred, the functions of the academic department and the school or college must change to support both the individual and collective responsibilities and development of faculty and to become the primary locus of responsibility for student learning.

In addiition, campus operations must change, bringing day-to-day decisionmaking as close as possible to the locus of the primary impact of those decisions. This will mean a major overhaul of the role and responsibilities of the administrative support units. If purchase orders can be issued directly from a departmental office using a new Financial Information System, then the old Purchasing Office must eliminate its processing functions and acquire the role of technical advisor/consultant to help units allocate their resources wisely. The Accounting Office ceases to serve a control function and instead must specialize in performance and financial auditing. And so on. To support these changes, a campus must invest in staff development and rethink how it supports its academic programs..

As the change spreads to more of the most vital aspects of campus life and culture, the skeptical faculty will gradually be outnumbered and may be cultivated by a consistent pattern of investments and rewards based on clearly articulated institutional goals and purposes. At this point, resources must be distributed on the basis of actual performance. Earlier some investment can be made in areas that have potential for contribution to the institutional mission, but the remaining skeptics will only be convinced if faculty and administrators are required to justify their budgets and any enhancement of their resource base on the basis of what they have contributed to institutional productivity, quality and success.

At this point, change still feels awkward and unnatural and it is often wise to slow down a little and evaluate the extent to which other aspects of campus culture and support must be adapted to reinforce the changes. At Portland State University, for example, the principles built into the design of General Education and the undergraduate major must be reinforced by how the resources in student affairs are utilized. This has caused us to undertake a major review of campus support for students.

5. As Yogi Berra should have said, "It ain't ever over."

We seem to be entering an era where change will be a consistent part of our professional experience, where we will never "solve" all of our problems or address, in a fully satisfactory way, the needs of a changing society. Several recent texts have begun to build a case for thinking about organizations in new ways. Authors such as Margaret Wheatley[13] and Gordon and Greenspan [14]draw lessons from the discoveries of quantum physics, chaos theory and the new "complexity science" about how to think about change in our institutions.

As our environment becomes more complex due to the effects of information and communication systems that spread patterns of mutual influence through society in complex and often unpredictable ways, we are forced to ask how we can introduce change meaningfully into a system that we cannot really understand, where the boundaries between what we can directly influence and what influences us grow blurry and where cause and effect are less and less clear.

In the traditions of a Newtonian world where the experience of a new technology caused observers to look at organizations in a mechanistic way, it was thought possible to divide a complex function into constituent parts, rather like manufacturing an automobile on an assembly line and to manage processed through elaborate and hierarchical control systems. The role of the leader was also defined in a specific way. Leadership consisted in defining a direction for the institution and then directing that protocols be designed to fit the work of each employee into this vision. In such a model, a leadership transition can be disruptive and may, in fact, overturn the process of change altogether.

In our new, more chaotic world, where new mathematical and computational tools permit us to see underlying order within situations that appear on the surface to be disorderly and to see repeating patterns of order (fractals) at different levels of magnification, guidance for change can be provided by a few simple principles that underlie the seeming disorder of what are, in fact, orderly but unpredictable processes. These simple principles or values can express the identity of a shared enterprise or system while allowing for considerable individual autonomy within the system. All faculty do not need

---

[13] Margaret J. Wheatley. Leadership and the New Science. Learning about Organizations from an Orderly Universe. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, 1992

[14] T. Gordon and D. Greenspan. The Management of Chaotic Systems. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 47: 49-62, 1994.

to choose the same spectrum of responsibilities, for example. It is probably more helpful to think of our institutions as organisms that are largely self-organizing and linked to larger ecosystems than to think of our organizations as machines that can be controlled through commands. In such a modei, while the leader at the top is still important, largely as spokesperson for the institution and as an interpreter of its experience, the change really is incorporated into the fabric of the institution itself, and no longer depends upon the ability of a leader to convince or motivate the campus community. In such an environment, leadership transitions need not derail an on-going and meaningful process of change. It is necessary to reshape the infrastructure, culture and rewards of the campus in order to promote genuine acceptance of change, and we are not done yet.